

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

- Remarks -

MPEP 707.07(f)

Applicant believes that the Advisory Action of 28 November 2008, may be incomplete under MPEP707.07(f). Applicant believes that the Examiner has not answered all material previously traversed by the Applicant.

In this regard, Applicant seeks withdrawal of the Advisory Action dated 28 November 2008, and issuance of a new official communication with an appropriately updated period for reply.

Should the Examiner deem that such action is not warranted, Applicant would appreciate notice (official or otherwise) from the Examiner to such effect, whereby further timely and appropriate action on the part of the Applicant may be pursued.

Applicant notes that the statutory period for reply can be extended to no later than 9 January 2008.

Applicant's Remarks on Advisory Action

In the comments provided with the Advisory Action of 28 November 2008, the Examiner stated that the Applicant previously contended that Brugue et al. disclosed a printer cartridge comprising only an ink supply assembly and ink reservoir, but not a pagewidth printhead. In this regard, the Examiner referred to Fig. 2 of Brugue et al., illustrating a cartridge/pen (200) comprising a printhead assembly (212).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misunderstood the Applicant's previously submitted arguments. The Applicant's previously submitted arguments stated as follows:

"The invention of claim 5 is directed to a printer cartridge that comprises a body configured for user insertion in, and removal from, a printer. The printer cartridge further comprises a pagewidth printhead. The combination of the above two features

renders it clear, to a person skilled in the art that the print head is, together with the body, also insertable in and removable from the printer.

The printhead assembly (102) of Brugue et al. does not satisfy the above limitation of claim 5 with regard to the pagewidth printhead. In paragraph [0017] of Brugue et al., it is described that the ink supply assembly (104) may be housed with the printhead assembly (102), or may be separate therefrom. In either case, the ink reservoir (106) of the ink supply assembly (104) may be removed, replaced, or refilled.

The above description of Brugue et al. fails to teach that the printhead assembly (102) is removable too.” (emphasis added)

The point which was argued was therefore that Brugue et al. failed to teach that the printhead assembly (102/206) is also removable. The Applicant did not submit that Brugue et al. failed to disclose a printer cartridge comprising a pagewidth printhead. In fact, Applicant explicitly acknowledged, with reference to paragraph [0017] of Brugue et al., that Brugue et al. described that the ink supply assembly (104) may be housed together with the printhead assembly (102) *[in the cartridge/pen]*. The Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action hence merely repeat and confirm a point already acknowledged by the Applicant explicitly.

As the Applicant's previous arguments have not been completely answered, Applicant seeks withdrawal of the Advisory Action dated 28 November 2008, and issuance of a new and complete Advisory Action addressing the material traversed.

Applicant maintains that whilst Brugue et al. describe that the printhead assembly and the ink supply assembly may be housed together in the inkjet cartridge/pen, Brugue et al. describes only that the ink supply assembly may be replaced/refilled. (paragraph [0017]).

The fact that Fig. 2 of Brugue et al. illustrates the cartridge/pen (200) comprising the printhead assembly (212) does not prejudice the Applicant's above assertion and argument. Fig. 2 of Brugue et al., and the accompanying description at paragraphs [0021] - [0020] do not teach or suggest that the printhead assembly (212) is user insertable and removable.

Throughout the entirety of the description of Brugue et al., the only component that is described as being user insertable and removable is an ink reservoir of the ink supply assembly [paragraph 0017].

As stated in the Applicant's previous response, the Applicant is prepared to amend claim 5 to explicitly recite that the pagewidth printhead is incorporated with the body, in an effort to secure an expedited allowance of the present application. As such, a request to amend claim 5 is resubmitted herewith.

However, even if the requested amendment of claim 5 is not entered, Applicant maintains that claim 5 as pending distinguishes over the cited combination of references for the above reasons.

Applicant looks forward to word of further official communication in due course.

- Amendments -

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be amended as indicated in the accompanying amended page(s), in which:

- Claim 5 is amended.

Claim 5 remains pending. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762